DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 429 506 HE 031 998

TITLE	The Workload of the USM Faculty. A Report to the Joint Chairs of the Senate Budget and Taxation Committee and the House Appropriations Committee.
INSTITUTION	Maryland Univ. System, Adelphi.
PUB DATE	1999-01-20
NOTE	20p.
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; College Instruction; *Courses; *Faculty Workload; Higher Education; *Productivity; State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*University of Maryland System

ABSTRACT

This report responds to a request from the Maryland legislature for information on the instructional workload of faculty in the University System of Maryland (USM), especially at the University of Baltimore, the University of Maryland (Baltimore County), and the University of Maryland (College Park). Following an introduction, the report summarizes data from fall 1997 to spring 1998 concerning faculty workload data in terms of faculty exceptions from teaching the "standard load," analysis of course exceptions by type, student credit hours generated by the core faculty, noninstructional productivity, faculty who did not engage in credit-bearing teaching, and instructional outcomes per full-time equivalent faculty. The following conclusions are highlighted: at each of these institutions, the proportion of faculty teaching the standard load increased from the prior year's level, and 27 percent of the faculty taught more than the standard load. However, the report criticizes the emphasis on faculty exemptions and notes that USM faculty productivity, as measured by the number of course units produced, the external funds attracted, and scholarly productivity, all continue to increase. Six tables provide detail on the investigation's findings at the 10 institutions comprising USM. An attachment presents the instructions followed by institutions in completing the report on faculty teaching load. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

ED 429 506

A REPORT TO THE JOINT CHAIRS OF THE SENATE BUDGET AND TAXATION COMMITTEE AND THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

ON

THE WORKLOAD OF THE USM FACULTY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 031 998

University System of Maryland

December 1, 1998

(Updated 1/20/99)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
University System of Maryland
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

I. INTRODUCTION

This is the fifth annual report on the instructional workload of the USM faculty. As last year, the FY 1998 Joint Chairmen Report requested that the USM report focus on the University of Baltimore, the University of Maryland, Baltimore County, and the University of Maryland, College Park. It is the intent of the committees to assess the full impact of implementing the Regents' policy on these three institutions. Specifically,

> *To provide an additional year of data for those institutions where it is not yet apparent if implementation of the Board of Regents' standards has resulted in a measurable increase in faculty workloads, reporting should continue for the 1997-1998 academic year for University of Maryland, College Park; University of Maryland, Baltimore County; and University of Baltimore. The format used should be that of the December 1997 report.*

Attachment A is a copy of the format used for 1997-1998 and the detailed instructions. As requested by the Joint Chairmen, the data by department for UB, UMBC, and UMCP are included as Attachment B. In accordance with Regents' policy charging the Chancellor with monitoring faculty workload for all USM institutions, this report includes summary data on all degree-granting institutions.

In the USM policy, a "course unit" is defined as equivalent to a three-credit course. Graded instructional experiences that do not follow the traditional course format (individual studies, supervision of dissertation research, supervision of student teaching, etc.) are converted to course units using the guidelines incorporated in the USM policy. In this report, the term "course" is used in place of "course units."

As part of his monitoring responsibilities, the Chancellor requested that the Regents' Internal Audit Unit audit the faculty workload data for all USM institutions. To date, data for seven institutions have been audited. The audits revealed some confusion on workload definitions. The data for this report reflect adjustments made as a result of the audits.

II. SUMMARY OF THE FALL 1997 - SPRING 1998 FACULTY WORKLOAD DATA

Tables 1 through 6 summarize the data provided by all USM institutions. These summary tables focus on the workload of the core (tenured and tenure-track) faculty[1].

Faculty Exceptions. Table 1 shows the number of core (tenured and tenure-track) faculty who taught the standard load or more, as well as the number who were given exceptions to teaching the standard load. Table 2 shows trend data for the last four years.

[1] All summary data in this report exclude department chairs.

- Of the 3,442 core faculty at the USM degree granting institutions, 13% were granted exceptions (other than for instruction-related factors and to engage in externally funded research) from teaching the standard load.
- Overall, the percent of faculty who teach the standard load has remained stable at 87% over the last three years.
- On the other hand, 27% of the USM faculty at degree-granting institutions taught more than the standard load for no additional compensation - an increase from last year's level (25%).

Analysis of Course Exceptions by Type. Table 3 is an analysis of the number of exceptions to the standard teaching load by type. The number of course exceptions granted in 1997-1998 (2,469) declined from last year's level (2,599).

- Externally funded research accounted for 27% of course load exceptions; most of these exceptions were found in the USM research institutions.
- Instruction-related factors accounted for 17% of the course load exceptions.
- Exceptions for department administration accounted for 12% of all course exceptions, and internal service for 6%.
- 22% of the exceptions to the standard load were for courses not being taught by faculty members on sabbatical. However, only 5% (181) of the core faculty were granted sabbatical. Many of the sabbaticals were granted for one semester, rather than one full year. The percentage of faculty granted sabbatical has been stable at around 5% each year.
- The 1997-1998 overall distribution of exceptions by type was similar to that reported for previous years, except for an increase in departmental administration and internal service. This increase may be a function of more precision in accounting for faculty workload.

Student Credit Hours Generated by the Core Faculty. Table 4 shows the number of student credit hours (SCH) generated by the core faculty by upper division, lower division, and graduate. Three-year trends are also included.

- At the lower division level (freshman and sophomore level courses), core faculty generated 50% of all SCH.
- At the upper division level (junior and senior level courses), core faculty generated 56% of all SCH.
- At the graduate level, core faculty generated 68% of all SCH.
- These data are similar to last year's. The USM institutions continue to be responsive to the concern expressed by members of the General Assembly that undergraduate students be exposed to the talents of more experienced tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Non-Instructional Productivity. Table 6 is a summary of the AY 97-98 non-instructional (mostly scholarly) productivity of the tenured and tenure-track faculty from the USM *degree-granting* institutions[2]. The data by institution are provided as ratios of FTEF[3].

- $316 million in externally funded research and training grants was awarded to tenured and tenure track faculty members. This figure does not include grants awarded to non-tenured, not on track faculty, nor does it include institutional grants such as Title III. It represents a

[2] UMBI's and UMCES' externally funded research grants and scholarly productivity are not included.
[3] FTE core faculty, excluding department chairs.

12% increase from 1996-1997. In the USM research institutions, the average per FTEF was $108,000 at UMB, $106,000 at UMCP, and $84,000 at UMBC[4]. The average for UB was $54,000; for UMES it was $36,00 and, for Bowie, it was $23,000.

- In one year, the USM core faculty published more than 900 books and 8,000 peer-reviewed articles, and made more than 9,500 professional presentations.
- The average USM faculty member spent 16 days in service to business, government, schools, and non-profit organizations annually.
- The tenured and tenure-track faculty reported levels of research and scholarly productivity significantly higher than last year's.

Faculty Who Did Not Engage in Credit-Bearing Teaching. Only 26 USM core faculty (about 0.6%) did not engage in credit-bearing teaching during AY 1997-1998. Twenty-four of them were at UMCP, including faculty assigned to the joint UMCP/VPI veterinary medicine program in Blacksburg, Va., and faculty on leave teaching/conducting research out of state.

Instructional Outcomes Per FTEF. Table 6 shows the trends in the number of courses taught by FTE tenured/tenure-track faculty in the last four years. In 1997-1998, the USM core faculty taught an average of 7.2 course units in the comprehensive institutions and 5.1 in the research institutions. These ratios fall within the ranges of the Regents' faculty workload policy: 7-8 for comprehensive and 5-6 for research institutions. For research institutions, the number of course units taught per FTE faculty in 1997-1998 represents the highest level in four years.

III. CONCLUSIONS

The focus of the Joint Chairs' request was on UB, UMBC and UMCP. At each of these institutions, the proportion of faculty teaching the standard load increased from last year's level: 80% to 82% at UB, 88% to 91% at UMBC, and 83% to 88% at UMCP.

The report originally requested by the General Assembly focused on the number of faculty who received exemptions from teaching the "standard load" to engage in research, service, etc. It was from this language that the focus of faculty workload and productivity became the number of "exceptions." This focus runs counter to the Regents' policy, which states that "the focus of external accountability (to the Regents and to the State) will be the department or academic unit, not the individual faculty member." The department chair is responsible for fulfilling the instructional, scholarship and research, and service responsibilities of his/her department. By differentially assigning faculty to these three functions, the resources of the department are maximized and its mission accomplished. The focus on exceptions also masks the reality of how departments are managed, as the temporary decline in the instructional productivity of any one faculty member is offset by the increase in the productivity of other faculty. As pointed out before, 27% of the USM core faculty taught more than the expected load, more than compensating for the 13% who were granted exceptions from teaching the standard load.

[4] Except for UMB, these data do not include grants awarded to non-departmental units, e.g., research centers.

For the second year, the USM has included an alternate measure that captures outcomes (i.e., course units taught per faculty), rather than processes (number of faculty granted exceptions). **The USM faculty productivity, as measured by the number of course units produced, the external funds attracted, and the scholarly productivity, continues to increase.** From the perspective of the Regents, it is the increase on the faculty productivity that should be the reporting concern, rather than the current focus on exceptions.

This report continues the Regents' monitoring of the USM faculty productivity, thus assuring the Maryland General Assembly that the USM is attentive to this critical issue. The teaching productivity of the faculty and the degree to which the tenured and tenure-track faculty teach freshmen and sophomores are part of the accountability indicators submitted to MHEC, and each USM institution has submitted benchmarks for AY 2000-2001.

The Regents remain committed to increasing the teaching and the non-instructional productivity of the USM faculty, and will continue to monitor the workload of the faculty on a regular basis. Further, at the request of the Chancellor, the Regents' Internal Audit Unit continues to audit the faculty workload data submitted by the institutions. The USM is aware that increases in faculty instructional productivity are slow to be achieved and require a steady, long-term commitment. The Regents and the Chancellor have expressed repeatedly such commitment.

Table 1
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND
Faculty Instructional Workload
Fall 1997 - Spring 1998

Analysis of Faculty Exceptions

Institution	# of Faculty Who Taught Standard Load	# of Faculty Who Taught More Than Standard Load	# of Faculty W/ Course Exceptions for Instruction and Funded Research	# of Faculty** W/ Course Exceptions for Other Reasons	% of Faculty** W/ Course Exceptions for Other Reasons
Bowie St. Un.	22	24	23	28	29%
Coppin St. Coll.	36	32	4	17	19%
Frostburg St. Un.	95	29	28	35	19%
Salisbury St. Un.	57	65	15	27	16%
Towson Un.	178	67	60	83	21%
Un. of Baltimore	47	35	11	21	18%
UMB	480	59	20	26	4%
UMBC	89	99	62	26	9%
UMCP	247	510	368	156	12%
UMES	28	18	13	11	16%
USM	1,279	938	604	430	13%

* Tenured and tenure-track faculty, excluding department chairs.

** Excludes faculty on sabbatical.

UMSA.OAA

UPDATED: 1/20/99

Table 2
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND
Faculty Instructional Workload
Proportion of Faculty Who Taught Expected Load or More
Core Faculty Only*

Institution	94-95	95-96	96-97	97-98
Bowie St. Un.	82%	86%	89%	71%
Coppin St. Coll.	85%	89%	91%	81%
Frostburg St. Un.	90%	84%	81%	81%
Salisbury St. Un.	89%	90%	90%	84%
Towson Un.	82%	87%	85%	79%
Un. of Baltimore	85%	77%	80%	82%
UMB	94%	94%	97%	96%
UMBC	92%	87%	88%	91%
UMCP	88%	85%	83%	88%
UMES	97%	100%	97%	84%
USM	89%	87%	87%	87%

* Tenured and tenured-track faculty, excluding dept. chairs and faculty on sabbatical

UMSA.OAA

UPDATED: 01/20/99

Table 3

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND

Faculty Instructional Workload

Fall 1997 - Spring 19998

Analysis of Course Exceptions by Type - Core Faculty

Institution		# of Course Unit Exceptions to Expected Teaching Load by Type									Total # of Course Except.
		Instruction	Department Administrat.*	External Research	Department Research	Service: Profession	Service: Internal	Service: Public	Sabbatical**	Other	
Bowie St. Un.	#	9	41	30	0	5	3	1	0	0	89
		10%	47%	33%	0%	5%	3%	1%	0%	0%	100%
Coppin St. Coll.	#	2	4	4	0	2	6	0	5	26	49
		4%	8%	8%	0%	4%	12%	0%	10%	53%	100%
Frostburg St. Un.	#	42	39	9	12	1	15	4	50	12	184
		23%	21%	5%	7%	1%	8%	2%	27%	7%	100%
Salisbury St. Un.	#	25	22	0	5	4	18	0	80	6	160
		15%	14%	0%	3%	3%	11%	0%	50%	4%	100%
Towson Un.	#	79	73	46	5	6	69	4	108	44	434
		18%	17%	11%	1%	1%	16%	1%	25%	10%	100%
Un. of Baltimore	#	6	21	18	5	0	1	0	33	22	106
		6%	19%	17%	5%	0%	1%	0%	31%	21%	100%
UMB***	#	0	7	15	0	0	8	2	6	3	41
		0%	17%	36%	0%	0%	20%	5%	15%	7%	100%
UMBC	#	21	8	73	24	0	4	1	73	9	212
		10%	4%	34%	11%	0%	2%	0%	34%	4%	100%
UMCP	#	224	70	435	125	9	19	7	177	61	1,127
		20%	6%	39%	11%	1%	2%	1%	16%	5%	100%
UMES	#	0	13	38	0	0	0	2	0	6	59
		0%	22%	64%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%	10%	100%
USM	#	408	299	667	176	26	143	21	532	189	2,469
		17%	12%	27%	7%	1%	6%	1%	22%	8%	100%

* These are exceptions for core faculty other than department chairs, whose reduced loads are factored in through a reduced expected teaching load.

** These are NOT the number of faculty on sabbatical, rather the number of courses the faculty on sabbatical did not teach.

*** Excluding professional schools (Medicine, Dentistry, Law and Pharmacy)

Table 4

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND

Student Credit Hours Generated by Core Faculty*

- By Level -

Fall 1997 - Spring 1998

LOWER DIVISION STUDENT CREDIT HOURS

	# of LD SCH	Total # of	% of Total LD SCH		
			1997-1998	1996-1997	1995-1996
Bowie State University	18,592	42,713	44%	44%	48%
Coppin State College	27,280	49,553	55%	49%	51%
Frostburg State University	43,532	64,154	68%	68%	65%
Salisbury State University	41,130	79,382	52%	52%	50%
Towson University	93,509	162,364	58%	51%	57%
University of Baltimore	387	636	61%	64%	42%
UMB**	NApp	NApp	NApp	NApp	NApp
UMBC	39,029	110,243	35%	37%	38%
UMCP	184,517	375,213	49%	51%	50%
UMES	19,502	54,934	36%	30%	29%
USM	467,477	939,191	50%	49%	50%

UPPER DIVISION STUDENT CREDIT HOURS

	# of UD SCH	Total # of	% of Total LD SCH		
			1997-1998	1996-1997	1995-1996
Bowie State University	12,408	30,317	41%	44%	43%
Coppin State College	13,329	21,458	62%	72%	72%
Frostburg State University	34,849	46,531	75%	69%	67%
Salisbury State University	36,904	59,992	62%	62%	67%
Towson University	80,783	109,991	73%	63%	72%
University of Baltimore	13,169	31,305	42%	56%	55%
UMB**	4,291	17,869	24%	28%	28%
UMBC	46,407	90,068	52%	53%	53%
UMCP	138,265	262,381	53%	57%	60%
UMES	10,221	26,579	38%	48%	41%
USM	390,627	696,490	56%	57%	60%

GRADUATE STUDENT CREDIT HOURS

	# of Gr SCH	Total # of	% of Total LD SCH		
			1997-1998	1996-1997	1995-1996
Bowie State University	8,931	22,658	39%	36%	41%
Coppin State College	3,607	6,106	59%	70%	76%
Frostburg State University	5,120	8,559	60%	59%	59%
Salisbury State University	3,339	4,941	68%	60%	61%
Towson University	14,341	18,216	79%	66%	73%
University of Baltimore	34,525	44,780	77%	80%	80%
UMB**	13,093	30,461	43%	44%	44%
UMBC	10,103	14,554	69%	70%	69%
UMCP	68,518	86,210	79%	79%	82%
UMES	1,720	5,041	34%	41%	46%
USM	163,296	241,525	68%	67%	69%

* Tenured and tenure-track faculty, excluding department chairs.

** Excluding the professional schools.

Table 5
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND
Core Faculty Non-Instructional Productivity
Per Full-Time Equivalent Faculty*

Fall 1997 - Spring 1998**

Institution	$s in Externally-Funded Grants & Contracts** Ratio Per FTEF	# of Books Published Ratio Per FTEF	# of Refereed Publications Ratio Per FTEF	# of Non-Ref. Publications Ratio Per FTEF	# of Creative Activities Ratio Per FTEF	# of Professional Presentations Ratio Per FTEF	# of Days Spent in Public Serv. Ratio Per FTEF
Bowie St. University	$23,081	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.2	9
Coppin St. College	$13,708	0.1	0.5	0.7	0.5	1.1	21
Frostburg St. University	$2,415	0.1	0.3	0.7	1.5	0.7	7
Salisbury St. University	$14,461	0.1	0.7	1.0	1.0	2.0	2
Towson University	$1,774	0.2	0.7	0.9	1.3	1.2	15
Un. of Baltimore	$54,429	0.2	1.3	1.3	0.8	1.3	25
UMB***	$108,427	0.2	2.2	0.6	0.2	2.2	9
UMBC	$83,570	0.2	1.8	0.4	0.5	2.4	9
UMCP	$105,599	0.3	3.3	1.4	1.4	3.6	13
UMES***	$36,339	0.2	0.5	0.7	1.2	1.4	7
All USM - Total Units	$316,294,133	914	8,298	3,602	3,465	9,514	45,686

* FTEF tenured/tenure track faculty, including department chairs.

** Does not include grants awarded to non-department units; e.g., Title III grants, and to non-state supported faculty.

*** Includes ALL faculty.

UMSA OAA

UPDATED 1/20/99

Table 6
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND
Trends in Course Units Taught by FTE Core Faculty

	1994 - 1995 Courses/FTEF	1995 - 1996 Courses/FTEF	1996-1997 Courses/FTEF	1997-1998 Courses/FTEF
Comprehensive Inst.				
Bowie St. Un.	8.8	7.7	7.7	7.4
Coppin St. Coll.	6.2	8.2	7.7	7.3
Frostburg St. Un.	7.4	7.3	7.3	7.0
Salisbury St. Un.	6.9	6.9	6.3	6.9
Towson Un.	7.8	7.4	7.2	7.6
Un. of Baltimore	5.2	5.3	5.8	5.7
UMES	7.4	8.4	8.5	8.6
All Comprehensive Inst.	7.2	7.2	7.1	7.2
Research Inst.				
UMB**	5.3	5.2	5.6	5.2
UMBC***	5.1	4.9	5.0	5.0
UMCP***	4.9	4.8	5.0	5.1
All Research Inst.	4.9	4.8	5.0	5.1
USM	5.9	5.8	5.9	6.0

* Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty, excluding department chairs.

** Excluding the professional schools.

*** State-supported FTE.

UMSA:OAA

UPDATED: 1/20/99

August 6, 1998

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND SYSTEM
FALL 1997 - SPRING 1998 REPORT ON FACULTY TEACHING LOAD

- INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS -

Time frame. The time period covered by this report is Fall 1997 and Spring 1998. The standard annual course units load (line 3), and the number of faculty who would have taught the standard load (line 12) are also requested for Fall 1997 and Spring 1998.

Type of Faculty. All information is requested by type of faculty. The last column provides for departmental totals. Some information is only requested for some type of faculty. This is indicated in the form by the shading of cells.

Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty. All persons (except the department chair) holding tenured and tenure-track positions who are classified as faculty (regardless of sub-classification: instructional, research and public service), and are so reported to the Maryland Higher Education Commission through the Employee Data System.

Department Chair. The person who holds faculty rank and has administrative and academic responsibility for managing the department or unit being reported.

Full-Time, Non-Tenured, Non-Tenure Track Instructional Faculty. All persons who, while neither tenured nor on the tenure track, are employed full time by the UMS, are classified as instructional faculty and are so reported to the Maryland Higher Education Commission through the Employee Data System.

Full-Time Non-Tenured, Non-Tenure Track Research or Public Service Faculty. All persons who, while neither tenured nor on the tenure track, are employed full time by the UMS, are classified as research or public service faculty and so reported to the Maryland Higher Education Commission through the Employee Data System, and whose salaries are supported, in whole or in part, by state funds.

Other Faculty. All other persons, other than teaching assistants, who taught in this department, either in one or in both semesters. This category includes adjunct and affiliated faculty, all part-time faculty, and non-departmental administrators (deans, assistant deans, etc.) who taught in this department. The only information required for this type of faculty is their number, the number of courses and course units taught, and the student credit hours generated.

Teaching Assistants. Typically, graduate students in the department whose tuition and fees are waived, and who may receive other remuneration in return for some type of instruction-related responsibilities within the department. The only information required for teaching assistants is their number, the number of courses taught, and the student credit hours generated.

Note: If a faculty member was employed in the Spring semester, but not in the Fall (and therefore not captured on the EDS file), they should be assigned to the column they would have been in had they been in the institution for the Fall EDS.

Basis for Departmental Expected Teaching Load. Very briefly, describe the basis for the department expected teaching load for core faculty. For example, institutional policy; national practice; accreditation requirements; etc.

Line 1: Number of Headcount Faculty. Include faculty who were on sabbatical, or employed for only one semester. Do not include faculty on leave without pay for the entire academic year.

Line 2: FTE Faculty. The number of headcount faculty adjusted to reflect their assignment to the department. For example, faculty who held a joint appointment in another department or UMS institution, and part-time tenured/tenure track faculty, should be reported as a fraction based on their appointment to the reporting department.

Line 2a: State-Supported FTE Faculty (OPTIONAL). Based on the proportion of a faculty salary paid from state instructional funds. For 12 month faculty, state-supported FTEs of less than 1.0 are multiplied by 1.22.

Line 3: 95-96 Standard Annual Course Units Load. The number of course units that each faculty member was expected to teach during the academic year 1995-1996 and the number of course units expected to be taught by each faculty member in academic year 1995-1996. Standard loads may differ by type of faculty. For purposes of defining standard instructional workload expectations, the course unit is defined as equivalent to a three-credit course. Departments which formulate this expectation in terms of credit hours, should convert the expected teaching load, for reporting purposes, to courses; e.g., 24 credit hours being equivalent to 8 courses.

Line 4: Number of Courses Taught on Load. The total number of courses taught on load by each type of faculty. Courses should be converted to 3-credit equivalent units. Therefore, a four-credit course would be reported in this line as 1.33. Similarly, a two-credit course would be reported as 0.67, and a one-credit course as 0.33. Contact hours should not be converted to courses. A course should be attributed to only one

faculty. Team taught courses and courses taught with the assistance of teaching assistants should be prorated. For example, a three-credit course taught by two faculty members should be assigned as 0.5 course to each faculty member, and a four credit course as 0.67. If a faculty member appointed solely to this department taught a course in another department, such course(s) should be included here.

Line 5: Number of Other Course Units Taught On Load. See table below for the weights that should be used to convert graded instructional experiences that do not follow the traditional course format (e.g., individual studies, supervision of dissertation research, etc.) to course units. If a faculty member appointed solely to this department taught a course unit in another department, such course unit(s) should be included here. Note: any time these weights are used, the resulting units should go into this line (if on load) or into line 11 (if on overload).

Course Level	N of Credits = 1 Course Unit
800-899 (dissertation & doct. level individ. studies)	10 Credits = 1 Course Unit
799 (masters thesis)	13 Credits = 1 Course Unit
500-798 (other graduate level individual studies)	18 Credits = 1 Course Unit
400-499 (graduate/ug level individual studies)	21 Credits = 1 Course Unit
100-399 (undergraduate level individual studies)	30 Credits = 1 Course Unit

Line 6-A: Total Courses + Course Units Taught. The addition of lines 4 and 5.

Line 6-B: Course Contact Hours (on load). These are the number of contact hours associated with the courses taught. Generally, a contact hour is a 50 minute block of scheduled time for "face to face" (including electronically delivered) instruction.

Line 7: Number of Student Credit Hours (on load). The total number of student credit hours generated, ON LOAD, by each type of faculty.

Line 8: Number of Lower Division Student Credit Hours. The total number of lower division student credit hours generated, ON LOAD, by each type of faculty.

Line 9: Number of Upper Division Student Credit Hours. The total number of upper division student credit hours generated, ON LOAD, by each type of faculty.

Line 10: Number of Graduate Student Credit Hours. The total number of graduate student credit hours generated, ON LOAD, by each type of faculty.

Line 11: Number of Courses Taught on Overload. The total number of courses and other course units taught on overload (for remuneration above base salary) by each type of faculty. Private instruction (e.g., music) for which a faculty member is paid extra

remuneration, and for which the student receives credit, should be reported in this line, using the conversion weights included in the instructions for line 5.

Line 12: Number of Faculty Who Taught Standard Load. Number of faculty members who taught the number of course units specified in line 3.

Note: Part-time core faculty, full-time faculty employed for only one semester, faculty on leave without pay for one semester, and faculty who held a joint appointment in another department or UMS institution, and whose teaching load was proportional to the standard load should be included here. For example, a part-time core faculty employed half-time who taught half the standard load should be included here. Similarly, individuals whose appointments are supported in whole or in part by Agricultural Experiment Station or Cooperative Extension Service's funds, and whose teaching load was proportional to the standard load should also be included here. For example, a faculty member half of whose salary was paid with Cooperative Extension Service funds, and who taught half the standard load should be included here.

Line 13: Number of Faculty Who Taught More than Standard Load. Number of faculty members who taught a number of course units larger than the number specified in line 3.

Line 14: Number of Faculty Exempted from Teaching Standard Load. The number of faculty members who did not teach the course units specified in line 3.

NOTE: LINE 12 + LINE 13 + LINE 14 = LINE 1

Lines 15 through 23: By Type of Exception (N of Faculty | Total Course Reduction). The faculty members reported in line 14 should be distributed according to the principal reason for their not teaching the course units specified in line 3. When more than one type of exception applies, the one accounting for most of the faculty member's reassigned time should be used.

NOTE: THE ADDITION OF THE NUMBER OF FACULTY IN LINES 15 THROUGH 23 SHOULD EQUAL LINE 14.

The total course reduction for each exception category should also be reported. For example, if one tenured professor was released of teaching two courses to develop a new course, and a tenure-track assistant professor was released of teaching one course to teach a course on an off-campus center, the entries in "Instruction-Related" (line 15), under "Tenured & Tenure-Track Faculty," would be 2 | 3 (e.g., two faculty members were released from teaching three courses). The # of course" a faculty member has been exempted from teaching does not necessarily have to add to whole

numbers. For example, a faculty expected to teach 8 courses who taught 7 courses and the equivalent of 0.3 course units in individual instruction should be reported as having been exempted from teaching 0.7 courses.

Line 15: Instruction. Exceptions from the standard teaching load based upon instruction-related factors, including class size; development of new courses; modality of instruction, including distance education; level of instruction; etc.

Line 16: Departmental Administration. Assumption of responsibility for the functions of assistant chair, program director, or for special departmental projects.

Line 17: Externally Funded Research and Service Activities. Assignment of additional time for research or service activities supported by external funds, either research or training grants.

Line 18: Department-Supported Research. (Departmental Research). Assignment of additional time for research activities supported by the department.

Line 19: Department-Supported Service - Profession. Assignment of additional time to serve in areas of service to the profession; e.g., as editor of a large journal.

Line 20: Department-Supported Service - Internal. Assignment of additional time in areas of service to the institution/system to serve in committees, as chair of faculty senate, etc.

Line 21: Department-Supported Service - Public. Assignment of additional time in areas of service to the public: schools, business, government, and non-profit organizations.

Line 22: Sabbatical. Exempted from teaching (either for a semester or for the entire academic year) by reason of being on sabbatical.

Line 23: Illness/Death/Other. If "other", specify for each faculty exemption falling in this category.

Line 24: Number of Faculty Who Did Not Engage in Credit Activity. The number of faculty who did not engage, during this academic year, in any credit-generating teaching activity.

Lines 25 through 35: Non-Instructional Productivity. Summary of the non-instructional productivity of the departmental faculty. These data are collected through the Survey of Faculty Non-Instructional Productivity. The non-instructional productivity

of faculty members who are not included in the form (e.g., research faculty whose salary is funded wholly from external sources) may be added to the column "Department Total." The departmental totals are divided by the FTE core faculty (line 2, column 1) to obtain the Ratio.

Line 25: Number of books published, including textbooks and edited works.

Line 26: Number of refereed works (such as journal articles, poems, short stories, etc.) published, including chapters in books.

Line 27: Number of non-refereed works published by commercial and non-commercial organizations, including newspaper articles.

Line 28: Number of creative activities ("non-verbal research") completed or in which the faculty member had a meaningful participation, including artistic (musical, theatrical and dance) performances; art exhibits; recitals; concerts; etc.

Line 29: Number of presentations given to conferences, seminars, etc. sponsored by professional associations.

Line 30: Number of externally funded research and training grants received this year.

Line 31: Number of faculty members in the department who were awarded externally funded research and training grants.

Line 32: Total dollar amount expended this fiscal year from all externally funded research and training grants awarded to faculty members.

Line 33: Number of days spent in public service with public school systems, government agencies, non-profit organizations, and businesses.

Line 34: Number of undergraduate students advised.

Line 35: Number of graduate/professional degree recipients for whom you served as program advisor, or on their master's thesis/dissertation committees (OPTIONAL).